

### REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated July 20, 2004 addressing Applicants' Request for Continuation and Submission dated June 3, 2004, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claim 1 requires a controller coupled to the pressure transmitter, the controller receives a pressure signal and in a first stage, compares the pressure signal to a pressure threshold to obtain a sensor status and in a second stage, qualifies the sensor status signal by generating a composite warning status in response to the sensor status, wherein the composite warning status provides an in-range signal when the pressure statuses have not exceeded the pressure threshold and the pressure transmitters are not in a fault condition. *Juzswik* is a tire pressure monitoring system with pressure gauge operating mode for indicating when air pressure within a tire is within a predetermined pressure range. On page 2 and 6 (Examiner's paragraph #2 and #6) of the Office Action states, "*Juzswik* discloses a warning status being provided within an in-range signal when the pressure statuses have not exceeded the pressure threshold prior to a false condition (col. 1, line 45 through col. 2, line2)." While it is true *Juzswik* discloses on line 45 of Col. 1 through line 2 of Col. 2 that "a need exists for an accurate and reliable air pressure measuring system and method for indicating that the air pressure within the tire has come within the desired pressure range during the filling process by the vehicle operator or service technician", *Juzswik* fails to disclose in a second stage, qualifying the sensor status signal by generating a composite warning status in response to the sensor status as required by claim 1. Additionally, *Juzswik* fails to disclose a controller coupled to the pressure transmitter, the controller receives a pressure signal and in a first stage, compares the pressure signal to a pressure threshold to obtain a sensor status and in a second stage, qualifies the sensor status signal by generating a composite warning status in response to the sensor status, wherein the composite warning status provides an in-range signal when the pressure statuses have not exceeded the pressure threshold and the pressure transmitters are not in a fault condition. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection

under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1.

Claim 4 requires in a second stage, qualifying the sensor status signal by generating a composite warning status in response to a sensor status, wherein the composite warning status provides an in-range signal when the pressure statuses have not exceeded the pressure threshold and the pressure sensors are not in a fault condition. *Juzswik* fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 4 as noted above in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 requires in a second stage, determining a composite warning status signal in response to a plurality of pressure status signals, wherein the composite warning status combines a low pressure warning status, a flat pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, and a sensor status for each of the received pressure signals. *Juzswik* fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 8 as noted above in claim 1. Also, the *Juzswik* reference fails to disclose in a second stage, determining a composite warning status signal in response to the plurality of pressure status signals, wherein the composite warning status combines a low pressure warning status, a flat pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, and a sensor status for each of the received pressure signals. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 8. furthermore, no reason has been shown why one of skill in the art would modify the *Juzswik* references

Claim 15 requires determining a composite warning signal in response to a high pressure warning status signal, a low pressure warning status signal, and a flat pressure status signal, wherein the composite warning status combines the low pressure warning status, the flat pressure warning status, the high pressure warning status, and a sensor status for each of the received pressure signals. *Juzswik* in view of *Bezek* fail to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 15 as noted above in claim 1. Also, the *Juzswik* and *Bezek* references fail to disclose in a second stage, determining a composite warning status signal in response to the plurality of pressure status signals, wherein the composite warning status combines a low pressure warning status, a flat

pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, and a sensor status for each of the received pressure signals. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* in view of *Bezek* fail to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 15. Furthermore, no reason has been shown why one of skill in the art would modify the *Juzswik* or *Bezek* references.

Applicants incorporate their previous response dated June 3, 2004, and respectfully request additional consideration by the Examiner. Specifically, the present invention is a method and system for mitigating false alarms in a tire pressure monitoring system for an automotive vehicle. Independent claims 1, 4, 8, and 15 were amended to clarify the patently distinct step in the second stage of the controller is generating a composite warning status. The composite warning status is a combination of a low pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, a flat pressure warning status. The composite warning status may also include additional warning statuses. Furthermore, the patently distinct composite warning signal is distinctively set forth in each of the currently amended independent claims. Applicants maintain that the prior art does not teach or suggest qualifying a warning signal in a second stage of the controller. However, in light of the Examiner's reply in the Final Office Action dated March 3, 2004, Applicants in the Request for Continued Examination dated June 3, 2004 amended each independent claim to include a composite warning status that is qualified in the second stage of the controller.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Juzswik* et al. (6,612,165). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully believe that the steps of the controller described in claims 1 and 4 are not taught or suggested in the *Juzswik* reference. *Juzswik* states, "[A]t step 214, a determination is made as to whether the pressure value indicated by the signal portion of the message packet of the response signal is within the tire is within the predefined pressure range. If the determination at step 214 is affirmative, the process 200 proceeds to step 216. At step 216, the controller 36 outputs the in-range signal to the second indicator 50..." (Col 7, lines 8-16, and Figure 2). *Juzswik* does not teach or suggest a method and system for mitigating false alarms in a tire pressure

monitoring system for an automotive vehicle. Moreover, *Juzswik* does not teach or suggest generating a composite warning status. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 are amended to clarify the warning status of the second stage of the controller is a composite. That is, the composite warning status provides an in-range signal when the pressure statuses have not exceeded the pressure threshold and the pressure transmitters are not in a fault condition. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner allow claims 1 and 4.

In the Final Office Action, claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Juzswik et al.* (6,612,165).

Applicants respectfully believe that the steps of the controller described in claim 8 are not taught or suggested in the *Juzswik* reference. Claim 8 is amended to include the warning status of the second stage of the controller is a composite. That is, the composite warning status is a combination of a low pressure warning status, a flat pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, and a sensor status for each of the received pressure signals. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 8. Further, no reason has been shown why one of skill in the art would modify the *Juzswik* reference.

In the Final Office Action, claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Juzswik et al.* (6,612,165) in view of *Bezek et al.* (6,278,363). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully believe that the steps of the controller described in claim 15 are not taught or suggested in the *Juzswik* reference in view of the *Bezek* reference. Claim 15 is amended to include the warning status of the second stage of the controller is a composite. That is, the composite warning status is a combination of a low pressure warning status, a flat pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, and a sensor status for each of the received pressure signals. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* in view of *Bezek* fail to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 15. Further, no reason has been shown why one of skill in the art would modify the *Juzswik* or *Bezek* references.

Applicants further assert that dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-14, and 16-20 are allowable for the reasons as set forth above in the currently amended independent claims. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this application in view of the comments above.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,  
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By: 

R. Scott Vincent  
Reg. No. 55,771  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500

Date: Sept 17, 2004